



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

in America, as indicated in the following table:—

	Obj. tr.	Subj. intr.		Subj. tr.	Example.
		Inactive.	Active.		
1. . .	A		A	B	Chinook
2. . .	A	A	B	B	Dakota
3. . .	A		B	C	Takelma
4. . .	A		B	B	Paiute
5. . .	A (sometimes subj. of passive)		A	A	Yana

Identity of letter symbolizes identity of pronominal form. Type 4 is probably either simplified from type 3 or else represents an earlier stage of it; both developments may well have taken place. Type 5 is no doubt a specialized simplification of type 4. What the historical relations between types 1 and 2 and between each of these and types 3–5 are, it is impossible to tell at present, though there is at least some evidence to show that type 4 tends to develop from type 2. The interpretation of the nature of the verb in each of these types is not always easy. The passive interpretation of the transitive may apply in certain cases of types 1 and 5.

E. SAPIR

UHLENBECK, C. C., *Het Identificeerend Karakter der Possessieve Flexie in Talen van Noord-Amerika* ("The Identifying Character of the Possessive Inflection in Languages of North America"). Reprinted from "Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling *Letterkunde*, 5<sup>e</sup> Reeks, Deel II," 345–371. Amsterdam, 1916.

Uhlenbeck calls renewed attention in this paper to the well-known fact that in many American languages the possessive pronouns, generally affixed to the noun, occur in two more or less morphologically distinct series,—one for nouns possession of which is of an inseparable nature, the other for nouns

denoting separable possession. The former category includes chiefly terms of relationship and nouns denoting parts of the body. A careful survey of the evidence presented by Uhlenbeck shows, that, though body-part nouns and terms of relationship are not infrequently classed together in contrast to separable nouns, there are sometimes special morphological features that distinguish the two types of inseparable nouns; further, that in certain languages only the terms of relationship constitute a special class as regards possessive affixes. Languages distinguishing separable and inseparable possession as such are Tlingit, Haida, Tsimshian, Chimariko, Muskogean, and Siouan. As a rule, however, the two pronominal series are not fundamentally distinct, but are morphologically related; in Tlingit, Tsimshian, and Siouan, the separability of the noun is indicated by an affixed element, while only in Chimariko are the possessive elements of the two series radically distinct. Moreover, in both Haida and Siouan the terms of relationship are not treated in quite the same manner as the body-part nouns. In Algonkin, of which he treats Blackfoot in particularly great detail, Uhlenbeck finds that, while there is no rigid classification of possessed nouns into separable and inseparable, a suffixed *-m-* is used with great frequency to indicate the separability of the noun.

The relative independence of terms of relationship as a class, suggested by Haida and Siouan, is still further emphasized by Takelma, in which such nouns have a peculiar set of possessive affixes as distinct from all other nouns, including such as refer to parts of the body; further by Yuki and Pomo, in which only terms of relationship have possessive pronominal affixes. In Mutsun (Costanoan), moreover, where there is, properly speaking, no possessive inflection, terms of relationship have different endings, according to the person of the possessor. Such examples strongly suggest that alongside of, or inter-

crossing, the classification of possessed nouns into separable *versus* inseparable, there is to be recognized an independent classification of possessed nouns into terms of relationship *versus* all others. Uhlenbeck does not take this view. He prefers to consider such languages as Takelma, Yuki, Pomo, and Mutsun as survivals of an earlier condition, in which both terms of relationship and body-part nouns constituted a separable class of possessed nouns; and that, as they grew more analytic in character, the body-part nouns gradually yielded to the analogy of the vast majority of nouns. Such a language as Haida, according to Uhlenbeck, represents a transition stage.

So long as we look at the facts in a purely schematic way, Uhlenbeck's historical theory seems plausible; but further consideration of the facts tends to cast doubt on the correctness of his view. Leaving Chimariko aside, it certainly seems suggestive that the fundamental difference between the separable and inseparable pronominal affixes of such languages as recognize the distinction merely lies in the presence of an affix of separable significance. The example of Algonkin, further, strongly suggests that this type of affix is a morphological element that has *per se* nothing to do with pronominal classification. On the other hand, the pronominal relationship-term affixes of Takelma, Yuki, Pomo, and Mutsun form a morphologically distinct class of elements. In other words, the two types of classification of possessed nouns (separable *versus* inseparable, and terms of relationship *versus* other nouns) work, on the whole, along quite distinct lines; whence we must conclude that they are historically distinct phenomena, and merely intercross in certain languages (Haida, Siouan).

That our point of view is sound (i.e., that the concept of separability or inseparability is generally, directly or at last analysis, indicated by an affix, and that, on the other

hand, the terms of relationship generally owe their distinctness as a class to the factor of pronominal classification), is further indicated by other linguistic data, in part not accessible to Uhlenbeck. In Southern Paiute there is no real classification of possessed nouns into separable and inseparable, nor any classification of possessive pronominal affixes; but there are two suffixes of not infrequent use that bear on the concepts of acquirement and inseparability,—*-i'ni-* ACQUIRED BY, OWNED BY (e.g., *qani-i'ni-* HOUSE OWNED BY ONE, *qani-* HOUSE, HOUSE ONE LIVES IN); and *-a-* INSEPARABLY BELONGING TO, chiefly used with body-part nouns that in ordinary experience often occur disconnected from the body, like BONE, SALIVA, SINEW, FAT, HORN (e.g., *oo-* BONE, *oo-'a-* BONE IN ONE'S BODY).

In Nootka, again, there is, with certain interesting exceptions to be presently noted, but one series of possessive pronominal affixes; but before the possessive suffix proper normally appears one of two suffixed elements,—*-uk-*, *-'ak-*, indicating that the possessor and the object possessed are physically separable (hence including terms of relationship); or *-'at-*, indicating that they are not physically separable (hence applying, above all, to parts of the body). The latter element is morphologically identical with the passive suffix in verbs. The Nootka *-'at-* forms suggest that, in any reduction of the range of the inseparable class of possessed nouns, it would be the terms of relationship—not, as Uhlenbeck assumes, the body-part nouns—that would be levelled out by analogy. From another point of view, however, the Nootka terms of relationship stand in a class by themselves. Not only are most of them provided with a distinctive relationship-term affix *-qso* (cf. the corresponding *-mp* of Kwakiutl), but the second person singular possessive is either formed in the regular manner (*-qso* plus separably possessive *-'ak* plus pronominal *-'itqak*, contracted to *-qsak'itqak*) or, far more frequently, by using the bare stem without

any affix whatever (*-qso* drops off: hence *THY UNCLE* is a simpler term than *UNCLE*). Further, the terms for *MY FATHER* and *MY MOTHER* are irregularly formed by adding the first person singular "objective" element *-s* directly to the stem, the vowel of which is lengthened (the normal affix for *MY* is *-qsak-qas*). These facts mean, for example, that while the forms for *MY FATHER* and *THY FATHER* have no suffix of physical separability, and fall outside the ordinary possessive pronominal scheme, such forms as *HIS FATHER*, *OUR FATHER*, and *MY UNCLE* are treated, as far as the possessive pronominal affixes are concerned, like an ordinary possessed noun; in neither sets of forms is the suffix of physical inseparability in place. As far as the Nootka evidence is pertinent, it is obvious that the concepts of separability and relationship-term classification are morphologically and historically unrelated.

The pronominal distinctness of terms of relationship is not as isolated a phenomenon as Uhlenbeck implies. Wishram<sup>1</sup> (Upper Chinook) affords us some interesting data. The possessive pronominal prefixes of terms of relationship in this language are precisely the same as for all other nouns, except for the first and second persons singular of the words for *FATHER* and *MOTHER*. In these isolated cases *MY* and *THY* are respectively expressed by *-na-* and *-ma-* instead of the normal *-tc-*, *-k-* *MY* and *-mi-* *THY*; the interesting point is, that *-na-* and *-ma-* are evidently closely related to the verbal pronominal prefixes *n-* and *m-*. Body-part nouns with possessives are in no way peculiarly treated in Wishram.

The combined evidence of Takelma, Yuki, Pomo, Mutsun, Nootka, and Chinookan for the occurrence of a distinctive series, sometimes only preserved in very fragmentary form, of possessive pronominal affixes for terms of relationship, can hardly be set aside

as pointing to a merely secondary reduction of the inseparable class of possessed nouns. A little reflection shows that terms of relationship as modified by possessive pronouns differ from most other nouns so modified, not so much in the matter of inseparability as in the fact that in the former a personal relation is defined, while in the latter true possession or some allied concept is indicated. Thus, *MY FATHER* is not one who is owned by me, but rather one who stands to me in a certain relation; moreover, he may be some one else's father at the same time, so that *MY FATHER* has no inherently exclusive value. On the other hand, *MY ARM*, like *MY HAT*, indicates actual and exclusive possession. Hence we can readily understand both why certain non-kinship nouns that indicate relationship are sometimes morphologically classed with kinship terms (e.g., *FRIEND* in Takelma, *SWEETHEART* in Nootka), and why, on the other hand, such relationship terms as do not involve an inherent or non-controllable relation frequently fall outside the true set of kinship terms (e.g., *HUSBAND* and *WIFE* are not treated like relationship terms in either Takelma or Nootka). That personal relation, not possession, is primarily expressed by the possessive pronominal affixes of relationship terms, is beautifully illustrated by the Iroquois usage of expressing many such relations as transitive verbs; thus, one cannot say *MY GRANDFATHER* or *MY GRANDSON* in Iroquois, but uses formal transitives which may be respectively translated as *HE GRANDFATHERS ME* or *I GRANDFATHER HIM*. Clearly, the morphological isolation of possessed terms of relationship finds abundant justification in psychological considerations. I would, then, in contradistinction to Uhlenbeck, allow for three fundamental types of classification of possessive pronouns in America:—

1. All nouns treated alike (Yana, Southern Paiute).

2. Relationship terms contrasted with other nouns (Takelma).

<sup>1</sup> The Paiute, Nootka, and Wishram facts are quoted from my manuscript field-notes.

3. Possessed nouns classified into inseparable (comprising chiefly body-parts and terms of relationship) and separable (Chimariko).

Sometimes types 2 and 3 intercross, when we get the triple classification of languages like Sioux and Haida.

Uhlenbeck's desire to look upon inseparability as the most fundamental concept involved in the so-called possessive relation is evidently largely determined by reasons of a speculatively psychological order. He notes with justice that the possessive pronouns of the inseparable category are generally simpler than those of the separable category; that the latter are, indeed, frequently derivatives from the former. From this he argues that originally only inseparable nouns (body-part nouns and terms of relationship) had possessive affixes at all. Further, aside from certain exceptions (Miwok, Mutsun, Chumash), he finds that where, as is generally the case, the possessive pronouns are related to the pronominal affixes of the verb, they agree in form, not with the subjective or energetic, but, on the whole, with the objective or *casus inertiae*. The evidence for this important and well-known fact is drawn from Tlingit, Haida, Tsimshian, Chinook, Chimariko, Maidu, Yuki, Pomo, Muskhogean, and Siouan, to which we might add Shoshonean and Nootka.

Uhlenbeck's psychological interpretation of this fact, as well as of the greater primitiveness of the possessive pronominal affixes of inseparable nouns, is given at the close of the paper: "Where there is identity of the possessive elements with inert personal elements, there can hardly be any talk of real 'possession,' seeing that, where real 'possession' is involved, we should rather expect similarity of possessive with energetic elements, as opposed to a distinct series of inert personal pronouns or personal affixes. If, now, we recollect the excellent remarks of Lucien Lévy-Bruhl on 'possession' in Melanesia, and bear in mind

that, for example, in Dakota a noun with inseparably-possessive affixes has entirely, or nearly so, the form of a conjugated adjective, or, aside from the, in Dakota, differently placed pronominal element, of a verbalized independent noun, we shall not go wrong in recognizing in the so-called possessively inflected noun an identifying expression. A [Dakota] form [meaning 'my heart'] thus does not signify 'my heart' in the manner of our civilized languages, but indicates the identity of myself with the one heart with which I, and no other, stand in the closest relation. Similarly the inclusive [Dakota form meaning 'child of us two'] is not so much 'child of us two' as indeed 'the child that we both are,' 'the phase of us two which is the child.' But it is impossible to transcribe into modern words the thoughts and feelings of 'primitives,' even though we are perhaps able to think and feel ourselves into them."

This psychological interpretation strikes me as extreme, the more so as I see no conclusive reason for assuming that possessive pronominal affixes were originally not employed with separable nouns. If we interpret Uhlenbeck's *casus inertiae*, as suggested in the preceding review, as a neutral form of no intrinsic case significance, then the identification of a functional possessive with a specifically intransitive or inactive case is arbitrary. As a matter of fact, in quite a number of American languages we find that the possessive affixes, while generally closely related to a series of pronominal affixes in the verb, are composed of a distinctively possessive element of non-personal significance and a pronominal element proper. This is the case, for instance, in Nootka and most of the Takelma possessive affixes. In such cases the possessive affix must naturally be periphrastically interpreted: MY as OF ME, BELONGING TO ME. Where the sign of general possessive relation is lacking, the pronominal affix can be conceived of as standing in an implicit position-determined genitive relation to the noun,

more or less as in noun-compounds (i.e., I-HOUSE, for MY HOUSE, might be conceived of as a compound with merely implied genitive relation, precisely as in a form like HEN-HOUSE if interpreted as HOUSE OF HENS). There is still a further method of interpretation, corresponding to the objective interpretation of the inactive or intransitive case given in the preceding review. This is to look upon the possessive affix as frankly objective (or dative) in character; e.g., to interpret a form like MY HOUSE as a semi-verbal HOUSE (IS) TO ME. As a matter of fact, the line between such predicative forms as IT IS MY HOUSE and such purely denominative forms as MY HOUSE is often very difficult to draw; e.g., in Chinookan. Either of these explanations of the verbal affiliation of the possessive pronouns of so many American languages seems preferable, in my opinion, to Uhlenbeck's mystical theory of identification. The less we operate with "primitive" psychology, the better. Modern research is beginning to make it clear that the psychology of civilized man is primitive enough to explain the mental processes of savages.

One more point before closing. I feel that Uhlenbeck is too much inclined to look for

functional or semantic explanations of possessive pronominal differentiation where purely phonetic factors are probably all that is really involved (e.g., in Washo; Salinan; Algonkin; and Takelma, aside from terms of relationship). A striking example of the failure to evaluate purely phonetic factors is afforded by his discussion of the Blackfoot terms *isk* BUCKET and its possessives (e.g., *no-xk* MY BUCKET). He considers the forms *isk* and *-(o)xk* as representing two etymologically unrelated stems, and connects this surprising phenomenon with such suppletive examples in Blackfoot as HORSE and MY HORSE (as also in Southern Paiute; similar cases occur frequently for DOG in America). It seems very much more likely to me that we are not here dealing with independent stems at all, but that an original *osk* was in Blackfoot regularly shifted to *oxk* (the back vowel and *k* pulling the *s* to a back position; namely, *x*). This explanation is practically demonstrated by comparing *no-xk* with Blackfoot *mo-xkats-is* FOOT (from Algonkin *\*-skāt-*; cf. Cree *miskât*<sup>1</sup> LEG).

E. SAPIR.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from Lacombe.